

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action of June 17, 2008 in which claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a).

Independent claims 1, 10, 14, 21 and 24 are amended for clarification as explained herein per suggestion of the Examiner in the Argument section of the Final Office Action of June 17, 2008.

Claims 1, 9-12, 21-26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Findlater et al., US2003/0223649.

Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Findlater et al., US2003/0223649. in view of Haavisto, US2002/0071037.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Findlater et al., US2003/0223649. in view of Lin, US Patent 6,778,216.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Findlater et al., US2003/0223649. in view of Yi, US Patent 7,003,040.

Claims 14-16, 18,19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin, US 6,778,216, in view of Yi, US 7,003,k040 and Findlater et al., US 2003/0223649.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin, US 6,778,216, in view of Yi, US 7,003,k040 and Findlater et al., US 2003/0223649, as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Atsum US 2005/0036046.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin, US 6,778,216, in view of Yi, US 7,003,k040 and Findlater et al., US 2003/0223649, as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Haavisto, US2002/0071037.

The applicant continues to disagree with the rejections repeated in the Final Office Action from the previous Office Action of December 31, 2007. Therefore, the arguments presented in the Amendment B filed with USPTO on February 4, 2008 are fully applied. In addition, the applicant refers to arguments made in remarks of Amendment A submitted on May 21, 2007 and Amendment for RCE submitted on October 18, 2007 in reference to unique limitations recited in claims 15-16, 17-20 and 27 of the present invention in regard to references of Haavisto, Lin, Yi and Atsum.

Moreover, the applicant disagrees with the Examiner statements in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Final Office Action of June 17, 2008 in regard to rejection of independent claims 1, 10, 14, 21 and 24 because it is clear from these claims themselves and especially in light of the support provided in the specification (as referred to by the Examiner) that horizontal and vertical downscaling are performed separately and not occurring at the same time. In spite of the disagreement with the Office, the applicant chose to amend the independent claims 1, 10, 14, 21 and 24, as submitted herein, to clarify this fact to overcome the Examiner's concerns and overcome rejection based on the references quoted by the Examiner.

In regard to motivation and/or justification to combine references, the Examiner asked (see page 4 of Final Office Action of June 17, 2008) the applicant to provide

the evidence. The Applicant is of opinion that it is the way around: the burden of proof is on the Office (see MPEP paragraph 2143) to provide a proof of motivation and/or justification to combine references quoted by the Examiner.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of June 17, 2008 having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-29 to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Anatoly Frenkel
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 54,106

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON, LLP
775 Main Street
P. O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234